DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 653 EA 024 097

AUTHOR Bernas, Thomas G.
TITLE Documenting the Implementation of School Based Management/Shared Decision Making in a Non-Chapter 1 Elementary School.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); Decentralization; Elementary Education; Organizational Climate; *Participative Decision Making; *Program Implementation; *School Attitudes; *School Based Management; School Organization; School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS *Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

The adoption of a school-based management/shared decision-making administrative process (SBM/SDM) was recommended for the Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) school district in June 1990. Findings of a study that determined the attitudes of three non-Chapter 1 elementary school communities in Philadelphia toward the adoption of SBM/SDM are presented in this paper. Methodology was based on surveys of parents, teachers, staff, parents, and community members at the three schools, which elicited returns of 27, 56, and 15, respectively. Observation of governance council meetings and interviews with parents, teachers, and parents were also conducted. Findings indicate that no correlation existed between the successful implementation of SBM/SDM and school climate. Recommendations for improving implementation of SBM/SDM include conducting early ethnographic-oriented documentation of progress at the individual school; utilizing a multifaceted analysis; and allowing for variability. Two tables are included. Appendices contain an instructional review day summary, the survey, school demographic data, and pilot survey results. (5 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347653

DOCUMENTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/ SHARED DECISION MAKING IN A NON-CHAPTER 1 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

A Research Paper Presented at the 1992 Annual Meeting
of the American Educational Research Association

Office of Educational [illegible]
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. Bernas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Thomas G. Bernas
School District of Philadelphia
Office of Assessment
Administration Building - Room 402
21st Street South of the Parkway
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EA 024 097

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DOCUMENTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/ SHARED DECISION MAKING IN A NON-CHAPTER 1 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

A Research Paper Presented at the 1992 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association

Thomas G. Bemas
School District of Philadelphia
Office of Assessment
Administration Building - Room 402
21st Street South of the Parkway
Philadelphia, PA 19103

I. Introduction

As has been the case in a number of larger school districts in recent years, the School District of Philadelphia has made the commitment to foster in its schools the implementation of a School Based Management/ Shared Decision Making process of administration. On June 12, 1990, the Superintendent of the School District, Dr. Constance E. Clayton, and the President of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers, Mr. Ted Kirsch, issued a joint memorandum supporting the adoption of this school management model. The basic procedure outlined for a school's adoption of SBM/SDM in Philadelphia was as follows:

- The school community, including administrators, faculty, para- and non-professional staffs, parents, and students would receive from the Central Administration and Regional Office information concerning SBM/SDM; this information was to be shared and discussed at faculty meetings, Home and School gatherings, and other informational opportunities. A school interested in adopting SBM/SDM would then submit a "Letter of Intent", signed by both the school's principal and its Philadelphia Federation of Teachers Building Representative, to the Joint Committee on Restructuring. The purpose of the letter was to indicate their desire to become involved in SBM/SDM. At this point, the school would then elect a Governance Council (thirteen member for K-8 schools, fifteen member for 9-12 schools) consisting of the school principal, as well as faculty, parent and community representatives.

- Following its submission of a "Letter of Intent", a school Governance Council would then develop cooperatively an "Educational Plan" designed to address the needs of its students. This document could include a request for waivers to provisions of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers contract, School Operations Policy of the School District of Philadelphia, School Board Policy, and/or local and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania educational regulations. In order for the school to become fully a SBM/SDM site, the devised "Educational Plan" would have to be approved both by the Joint Committee on Restructuring and 75% of the voting members of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers bargaining unit at the school.

A general acceptance of the SBM/SDM model, albeit with some reservations, was discerned from the analysis of the results of a comprehensive survey that had been administered by the Office of Assessment of the School District of Philadelphia in March, 1991 to well over 10,000 School District personnel (Appendix A). As of June, 1991, however, the Joint Committee on Restructuring had received no proposed "Educational Plans" for approval.

II. Objective

The purpose of this research paper is to determine what differences in attitude, if any, relating to the adoption of School Based Management/ Shared Decision Making may be discerned on the part of three School District of Philadelphia, non-Chapter 1 elementary school communities.

III. Literature Review

In discussing current educational research related to the subject of School Based Management/Shared Decision Making, the observation of Jane L. David in 1989 holds true to a great degree in 1992:

> ...there is surprisingly little empirical research on the topic. Searches of educational indexes yield numerous references for school-based management, but virtually all are conceptual arguments, how-to guides and testimonials from practitioners.
>
> (David, 1989)

Raymond Golarz (August, 1990) suggested that the rationale for SBM/SDM lay in the effective schools research which emerged during the last fifteen years. He contended that this research clearly supported the notion that the "largest unit of effective school change or improvement is not the school district, but rather the individual building or site..." Not surprisingly, therefore, and consistent with Golarz's argument that SBM/SDM improved a district only through the improvement of one building at a time, no documentation exists of a successful SBM/SDM school district. The success stories are told about individual sites that experienced some gains after embracing this management model.

Justification for the adoption of SBM/SDM is not difficult to find, particularly in view of the fact that elements of the model were "borrowed" from the private sector. Research has shown that the meaningful involvement of employees yields positive outcomes for organizations. Studies have confirmed that orgnizations which employ a shared decision making model reap benefits, such as "...greater employee morale and satisfaction, organizational commitment and acceptance of change, and cooperation and reduction of conflict." (Conley, et al., 1988)

In relating shared decision making to school outcomes, William J. Baily in his book "School-Site Management Applied" (1991) discussed an effective school as a "productive work-place." He maintained that workers "need to identify with the place in which they work." In effect, he noted that in districts where SBM/SDM was operational "the school system becomes a system of schools."

Last year's 1991 Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) witnessed a number of presentations relating to the adoption of SBM/SDM. Of particular interest to this writer were the varied experiences in implementation of this management model in diverse school districts like Dade County, Florida and Memphis, Tennessee. Underlying so many of the presentations delivered was the necessity to document the implementation process from its very beginning. This need to document was emphasized in Dr. Paula M. Short's "The Empowerment Project"; such chronicling, the author felt, obviously can provide a rich source of guidance to other schools becoming involved in the SBM/SDM process. (October, 1990)

In summary, therefore, a review of the literature supports the necessity to document a school's adoption of SBM/SDM. However tedious this documentation may be, and however non-spectacular some findings may seem, nonetheless, in accordance with ethnographic research which focuses on process and not just on product/outcome, the objective recording of a school's implementation process may contain valuable lessons on what should be done, when and by whom. And this documentation process requires a multifaceted approach to data collection. As David pointed out, "Implementing Site Based Management involves a lot of pieces and takes a long time, from 5 to 10 years; it is premature to pass final judgment on districts in the early stages." (1989) One such "piece" that may be of use in assessing the implementation of SBM/SDM in the School District of Philadelphia is a baseline survey administered at three school sites whose results form the basis of this research paper.

IV. Methodology

Survey Instrument

In April, 1991, a baseline data survey (Appendix B) was devised by staff members of the Office for School Operations and the Office of Assessment of the School District of Philadelphia. The purpose of thesurvey was to obtain data about how members of a school's community felt about SBM/SDM prior to its implementation, and to assess their feelings about certain elements of the school's current climate. This survey contained thirty statements to which respondents were asked to indicate by a four point scale (1= Strongly Disagree/4= Strongly Agree) their degree of concurrence with each statement.

The thirty statements on the survey (along with a thirty-first item which requested respondents to select one of seven statements that best described what SBM/SDM meant to them) in general focused on two main questions:

- What do members of the school community think about SBM/SDM?

- What do members of the school community think about their school's climate?

Survey items were devised to elicit these perceptions both directly and indirectly. For instance, item #22 stated "Site Based Management is a good idea.", whereas item #1 made no use of the term Site Based Management; rather, the statement touched on SBM/SDM by asking respondents to react to the statement, "Involving parents in decision making in the school is a good idea." In similar fashion, item #17 read "There is a positive climate in my school."; the statement "I like teaching/working in this school." (item #26), on the other hand, related to school climate even though the term was not included in the item as such.

Insofar as the goal of SBM/SDM is to include as many groups in the management process as possible, it was decided that the survey - which was to be completed anonymously - was to be made available for completion to all members of three non-Chapter 1 elementary school communities including principals, teachers, para- and non-professional staffs, parents, and other interested community constituencies.

Site Selection

As of January 1, 1992, baseline data surveys had been completed by individuals belonging to three non-Chapter 1 elementary school communities and returned to the writer for analysis. A cursory overview of these three sites' School Data (Appendix C) would indicate a few similarities among the three (e.g., Student Average Daily Attendance Rate, Dates of Principals' Appointment to School), but by far there are many more differences between and among them even though all three are categorized as non-Chapter 1 sites. Far more relevant to this study than individual school variables, however, would be a discussion of the degree of progress each school has attained in its implementation of SBM/SDM.

School A (Survey N= 27)

In September, 1991, School A seemed well on its way to becoming the first elementary school in the School District of Philadelphia formally to adopt SBM/SDM. A "Letter of Intent" had already been submitted, and the school's Governance Council was working on developing its "Educational Plan" for approval by the Joint Committee on Restructuring and 75% of the school's voting members of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers bargaining unit. Upon completion of the "Educational Plan", the crucial faculty vote was conducted: the plan was voted down by a single vote. As of January 1, 1992, the Governance Council was no longer meeting. According to the school administrator, lest he appear as though he was trying to impose his will on the faculty, the principal in the meantime had assumed a "Wait and See" attitude feeling that another vote on the school's "Educational Plan" might be taken in late spring of the current school year.

School B (Survey N= 56)

Like School A, this site likewise had submitted a "Letter of Intent" in late Spring, 1991. Upon the opening of school in September, the Governance Council again convened to discuss various issues related to SBM/SDM. According to the school principal, prior to beginning work on an "Educational Plan", the Governance Council experienced a high degree of frustration discussing just what areas in school management it would ultimately control, and how that control would be exercised. Faced with this crisis, the Governance Council in November voted to discontinue meeting until "some direction was gotten from Central Administration." Hence, as of January 1, 1992, although its "Letter of Intent" had not been retracted, this site's SBM/SDM progress was on hold.

School C (Survey N= 15)

Like School A and School B in this study, School C got involved initially with SBM/SDM in late Spring, 1991. Its major difference with the other two sites, however, has been its degree of progress. A Governance Council was formed, and continues to meet and discuss on a regular basis. As one of its members stated, "Progress here has been a bit slow - you know, two steps forward, one back." Observations by this writer of School C Governance Council sessions disclose that Governance Council members regard their progress in the implementation of SBM/SDM as natural for them. Rather than beginning work on an "Educational Plan", for instance, a good deal of effort continues to be expended on such matters as "Consensus Building", "How to Conduct a Meeting", and publicizing their work.

V. Research Findings

In January, 1992, after the last of the baseline data surveys had been received from the three elementary school communities and tallied, the writer realized two potential problems inherent in the methodology. First, as the following table illustrates, the composition of the completed survey sources varied greatly among the three sites. And second, not surprisingly because the three principals whose schools were involved in the study had been requested to distribute surveys to anyone in their school communities who wished to complete one, there were marked differences in the quantity of surveys received back from the three school communities. It was finally decided that nothing could be done to resolve the first problem dealing with the obvious disparities in the numbers of constituencies represented. To have included survey results, for instance, only from administrators and teachers would have denied the basic tenet of SBM/SDM that school management must include input from all school community members, be they professional, para- and non-professional, parent or other interested elements of the community at large. As for the significant sample size disparity, it was felt that the use of a weighted average for each survey item to be discussed would remedy problems in interpretation of final results.

Table 1
Number/Respondent Category of Completed Surveys

School	Number of Surveys	Category of Respondent	
A	27	Teacher	23
		Paraprofessional	3
		Other	1 (Secretary)
B	56	Administrator	1
		Teacher	39
		Paraprofessional	4
		Other	5 (Noon Aide)
			2 (Unknown)
			1 (Parent)
			1 (Nurse)
			1 (Bus Monitor)
			1 (Class Asst.)
			1 (Teacher Aide)
C	15	Administrator	1
		Teacher	7
		Paraprofessional	2
		Other	2 (Parent)
			1 (Aide)
			1 (Secretary)
			1 (Unknown)

Of the thirty-one items included on the baseline survey data, nine were selected for tallying and weight averaging that most specifically addressed respondents' attitudes toward SBM/SDM and their current school climate. Table 2 contains the survey statement, followed by degree of agreement as indicated by weighted average, by school site. (Individual total responses to survey statements, by school site, are included in Appendix D.)

Table 2
Weighted Averages of Degrees of
Agreement to Selected Survey Statements
by School Site

Scale: Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 Strongly Agree 4

Statement	Weighted Average of Response from School		
	A	B	C
1. Involving parents in decision making in the school is a good idea.	3.15	3.00	3.27
4. SBM will impact positively on student achievement and attitudes.	3.15	2.80	3.33
7. I intend to remain in this school.	3.73	3.63	3.54
13. SBM will become a permanent feature in American education.	2.93	2.71	2.64
17. There is a positive climate in my school.	2.73	3.28	3.09
22. SBM is a good idea.	3.19	2.98	3.33
24. I look forward to coming to work.	3.35	3.56	3.18
26. I like teaching/working in this school.	3.54	3.69	3.47

As suggested by data results from Statements #1, 4, 13, and 22, School A (which made the greatest progress of the three schools in implementing SBM/SDM, but where the Governance Council no longer convenes following the failure of its proposed "Educational Plan" in a faculty election by one vote) continues to maintain a slightly favorable attitude toward SBM/SDM. This may be understandable in view of the fact that School A wrestled with SBM/SDM, and came very close to becoming the first elementary school in Philadelphia to adopt the management model. School B's experience with SBM/SDM, on the other hand, was less productive; their Governance Council ceased functioning prior to beginning work on an "Educational Plan." As reflected by survey results, therefore, School B is understandably less enthused about SBM/SDM. School C (whose Governance Council has been meeting on a regular basis, realizing slow but steady progress) seems closer to School A than School B in its attitudes toward SBM/SDM. School C may feel that, if its Governance Council perseveres long enough, an "Educational Plan" may be devised and approved, whereas School B, in frustration, may have given up totally on the management model. It is interesting to note, however, that all three school sites, on the basis of survey results, appear to doubt the permanence of SBM/SDM in American education.

The above attitudes toward SBM/SDM appear to have been corroborated somewhat by the responses received to Item #31 on the survey, "Which statement best describes what Site Based Management means to you?" At School A three of its twenty-seven respondents characterized SBM/SDM as an "Erosion of the union contract", whereas none in School B and only one out of fifteen did so in School C. Close to one-third of all respondents at the three sites answered "Uncertain at this time", which may reflect a safe, "Wait and See" attitude. Not surprisingly, ten of the fifty-six respondents at School B, where SBM/SDM ceased implementation following a period of frustration, categorized the management model as being "Another fad", whereas no one at Schools A and C felt this way. Finally, in spite of their mixed experiences in its implementation, slightly more than one-half (52%) at School A, slightly less than one-half (43%) at School B, and fully one-third (33%) of the respondents at School C characterized SBM/SDM as a "Meaningful involvement of staff in decisions which affect them."

Any correlation between attitudes toward SBM/SDM and current school climate on the basis of the survey responses to Statements #7, 17, 24, and 25 appears conjectural at best. The overwhelming majority of respondents at all three sites indicated their intention to remain in their respective schools. School B, which was most critical of SBM/SDM, appears to have the most positive school climate of the three. Perhaps, to use a cliche, the School B community feels that "If it isn't broke, don't fix it." School A's climate, on the other hand, ranked least positive of the three sites. Perhaps community feelings were seriously affected by the previous very close defeat of its Governance Council's "Educational Plan." One very hopeful finding reflected in the survey results, however, was that regardless of their attitudes toward SBM/SDM, respondents at all three sites significantly indicated that they looked forward to coming to work, and that they liked teaching/working in their respective schools.

Conclusion

The completion of this research paper for presentation at the 1992 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association involved a great deal more than devising a baseline data survey and then tallying and averaging the results from three non-Chapter 1 elementary school community members. Interviews with school principals, teachers and parents, combined with observations at Governance council meetings, all contributed qualitatively to many of the findings suggested by the quantatative analyses of the survey results. As a result of the overall experience of this research project, the following conclusions appear warranted:

- As previously completed research has strongly suggested, the early documentation of the implementation of SBM/SDM is highly recommended so as to avoid the replication of mistakes and misunderstandings at other sites.

- The recommended documentation of all phases of SBM/SDM should incorporate ethnographic research qualities; most specifically, due attention must be paid to process as opposed to research that just focuses on product/outcome.

- The evaluation of SBM/SDM must be multi-faceted: in addition to quantative analyses, there must be included qualitative findings derived from such sources as interviews and long-term observations of various processes involved in the implementation.

- This research experience likewise confirms lessons learned by other observers of SBM/SDM, namely that a strict time schedule cannot be devised for the successful implementation of the management model at a school site. Schools will progress at their own rates, depending on a wide variety of factors involving personalities, leadership styles, perceived student needs, funding, and community involvement.

- The originally held supposition that some type of correlation exists between the successful implementation of SBM/SDM and school climate appears unwarranted. Schools with favorable climates may adopt SBM/SDM as a natural progression of what is perceived as a partnership among administration, faculty, and community; or such schools may reject the management model as an unnecessary fad. Likewise, schools with unfavorable climates may implement SBM/SDM in the hope of improvement, or dismiss it as a clever ruse designed to shift the blame for administrative and fiscal failure from management to faculty and community.

- Finally, the successful implementation of SBM/SDM will not be realized with the establishment of just one, strict managerial model. Rather, in all probability SBM/SDM will vary from site to site, a fluid rather than a static entity, forever changing to meet the challenges and demands of an educational community.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONAL REVIEW DAY SUMMARY

Prepared by: Thomas G. Bernas

INTRODUCTION

The Instructional Review Day 1991 was conducted on Tuesday, March 19th at School District of Philadelphia sites throughout the city. Over 16,000 personnel from various levels gathered to exchange information and ideas concerning School Based Management/Shared Decision Making (SBM/SDM). The full-day session included a variety of activities. This summary, however, contains the findings derived from two processes that took place at all of the sites:

1) Focus Group Discussions
2) Completion of Participant Feedback Sheets

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

A total of 641 facilitator groups (each consisting of approximately 25 members from various levels and work locations) met to discuss SBM/SDM. A Facilitator Summary Worksheet was completed by the facilitator in each group. Among the findings provided by an analysis of these worksheets were:

. Forty-eight percent of the 617 facilitator groups able to determine an answer to the question relating to degree of comfort reported that they were comfortable with the concept of SBM/SDM.

. Among the three positive, anticipated outcomes of SBM/SDM most frequently identified by the groups were:

1) Increased school/parent/community/student communication (281);

2) Increased staff involvement in school decision making (269);

3) More responsiveness to the needs of the school, thereby leading to direct benefits for students (210);

4) Increased cooperation/communication among staff, thereby resulting in better school climate (167);

5) Improved staff/student morale (134).

. The groups most commonly cited the following skills/information/ support that would enable them to implement SBM/SDM:

1) Staff development in SBM/SDM (507);

2) Clearly defined steps/criteria for implementing SBM/SDM (122);

3) Opportunities to meet with staffs from other SBM/SDM schools (98);

4) Opportunities to visit "model" SBM/SDM schools (71);

5) Increased planning time and budgetary resources (57).

. The majority of the 544 facilitator groups citywide who answered the related question felt that SBM/SDM will yield positive outcomes for students and schools:

Yes (234/43%)
Yes, provided that....(126/23%)
Uncertain (105/19%)
No (79/15%)

. An extensive and varied series of responses were received to the item entitled "Additional Concerns." Among the responses (which are not rank-ordered) were:

- Fear that principals will not give up control

- Problem of governance council accountability

- Elimination of jobs

- Election to governance council evolves into a popularity contest

- Union leadership sanctioned this initiative without knowledge or consent of union membership

- Real commitment of School District administration to SBM/SDM

- Compensation for necessary additional time to be spent

- Funding adequacy

- Loss of due process due to SBM/SDM's "hidden agenda"

- Ploy to break teachers' contract

- Final veto power

- Teachers given the responsibility, but not the power
- Another idea that will be dropped in three years
- We're teachers, not administrators
- How will the success of SBM/SDM be measured

COMPLETION OF PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK SHEETS

On Instructional Review Day, Participant Feedback Sheets were completed by 11,538 participants, who indicated their School District of Philadelphia positions as follows:

	N
Teachers	8,252
Classroom Assistants	1,245
Other	551
Secretaries	276
NTA/Security Personnel	270
Principals/Assistant Principals	204
Parents	148
Cafeteria Personnel	102
Facilities Personnel	15
Early Childhood Personnel	13
No Response	462

The following findings were derived from an analysis of responses received relating to the degree of agreement respondents felt to a series of statements relating to SBM/SDM:

STATEMENT	STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE				
	Principals/ Asst. Prin.	Teachers	Parents	Secretaries	Class. Asst.
The video/panel discussion was informative	N:197 132-67%	N:7889 3891-49%	N:135 84-62%	N:253 127:50%	N:1139 637-56%
There was widespread participation in group sessions	N:203 161-79%	N:8182 5756-70%	N:145 113-78%	N:268 186-69%	N:1207 859-71%
The group sessions provided immediately useful knowledge	N:201 103-51%	N:8163 3506-43%	N:146 96-66%	N:269 126-47%	N:1205 680-57%

STRONGLY AGREE/AGREE

	Principals/ Asst. Prin.	Teachers	Parents	Secretaries	Class. Asst.
The objective of the day was clear	N:201 136-68%	N:8169 4390-54%	N:145 87-60%	N:268 130:49%	N:1207 669-55%
The discussion helped me to clarify my role in School Based Management	N:203 96-47%	N:8158 2657-33%	N:144 74-51%	N:265 67-25%	N:1192 454-38%
I would like to be involved in School Based Management	N:201 137-68%	N:8081 4028-50%	N:147 102-69%	N:258 98-38%	N:1149 554-48%
I need more information about School Based Management	N:202 161-80%	N:8159 6929-85%	N:145 121-84%	N:267 200-75%	N:1195 888-74%

CONCLUSION

Analyses of the results of Focus Group Discussions (as contained in the Facilitator Summary Worksheets) and the Participant Feedback Sheets suggest that most personnel found the Instructional Review Day to have been a worthwhile learning experience. Although an optimism, albeit somewhat guarded by some, relating to the potential success of SBM/SDM was evident on the part of School District of Philadelphia staff, nonetheless, it is obvious that a strong desire and need appears warranted for more information and staff development concerning the implementation of School Based Management/Shared Decision Making. Apprehension on the part of some personnel is almost predictable whenever a new idea is introduced, particularly in a tradition-bound environment like education. What is particularly noteworthy about the results of participant reactions to SBM/SDM as summarized above, however, is the willingness on the part of most individuals to recognize their need to obtain more information about the new management system before passing judgement on its merits.

LAST NAME & INITIAL

PUPIL I. D. NO. | SCHOOL

ROOM | GRADE | PRO-GRAM | PG

SEX (F) (M)

Scanner Forms Inc. 18-1460-5432

DIRECTIONS

OFFICE FOR SCHOOL OPERATIONS
Instructional Review Day
March 19, 1991
Participant Feedback Sheet

NOTE: ONLY USE THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE FORM.
Indicate your position in Items A or B.
Respond to Items C-I using the following scale:

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 DO NOT AGREE 4

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Use black lead pencil only. (No. 2½ or softer)

Make heavy black marks that fill circle completely.

Erase completely any answer you wish to change.

Make no stray marks on this answer sheet.

○ HEADER

A. Identify your position: 1. Principal/Asst. Principal 2. Teacher 3. Parent 4. Secretary 5. Classroom Assistant	①	②	③	④	⑤
B. Identify your position: 1. Cafeteria Personnel 2. Facilities Personnel 3. Early Childhood 4. NTA/Security 5. Other	①	②	③	④	⑤
C. The video/panel discussion was informative.	①	②	③	④	⑤
D. There was widespread participation in group sessions.	①	②	③	④	⑤
E. The group sessions provided immediately useful knowledge.	①	②	③	④	⑤
F. The objective of the day was clear.	①	②	③	④	⑤
G. The discussion helped me to clarify my role in school based management.	①	②	③	④	⑤
H. I would like to be involved in school based management.	①	②	③	④	⑤
I. I need more information about school based management.	①	②	③	④	⑤
	①	②	③	④	⑤
	①	②	③	④	⑤
	①	②	③	④	⑤
	①	②	③	④	⑤

21

4/76 PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE OTHER SIDE

OFFICE FOR SCHOOL OPERATIONS

SITE BASED MANAGEMENT

Baseline Data Pilot

School Level _____ **elementary** **School Code** _____

_____ **middle school** **School Name** _____

_____ **high school**

Position _____ **Administrator**

_____ **Teacher (including House Directors)**

_____ **Paraprofessional**

_____ **Other** _____
(Please specify)

Directions: Use the following scale to determine the appropriate response to the statements below. Circle the number which best represents your degree of agreement. Thank you.

		Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	Strongly Agree 4
1.	Involving parents in decision making in the school is a good idea.	1	2	3	4
2.	I am treated by my colleagues in a professional manner.	1	2	3	4
3.	I am treated by community members in a professional manner.	1	2	3	4
4.	Site Based Management will impact positively on student achievement and attitudes.	1	2	3	4

2

		Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	Strongly Agree 4
5.	Staff members work together to get things done.	1	2	3	4
6.	I intend to remain as a employee of the School District of Philadelphia.	1	2	3	4
7.	I intend to remain in this school.	1	2	3	4
8.	I intend to remain in this school because of Site Based Management.	1	2	3	4
9.	I am treated by my principal in a professional manner.	1	2	3	4
10.	The atmosphere in my school is conducive to learning.	1	2	3	4
11.	Site Based Management will impact positively on teacher professionalism.	1	2	3	4
12.	I consider myself a professional.	1	2	3	4
13.	Site Based Management will become a permanent feature in American education.	1	2	3	4
14.	My school is a safe and orderly place to be.	1	2	3	4
15.	My school involves parents in decision making.	1	2	3	4
16.	My colleagues are supportive of me.	1	2	3	4

		Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	Strongly Agree 4
17.	There is a positive climate in my school.	1	2	3	4
18.	There is good communication between principal and teachers.	1	2	3	4
19.	There is good communication between teachers and teachers.	1	2	3	4
20.	There is good communication between teachers and paraprofessionals.	1	2	3	4
21.	My school is a pleasant place in which to work.	1	2	3	4
22.	Site Based Management is a good idea.	1	2	3	4
23.	My school involves paraprofessionals in decision making.	1	2	3	4
24.	I look forward to coming to work.	1	2	3	4
25.	In decision making, the principal actively seeks ways to involve				
	a. teachers	1	2	3	4
	b. paraprofessionals	1	2	3	4
	c. parents	1	2	3	4

4

		Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	Strongly Agree 4
26.	I like teaching/working in this school.	1	2	3	4
27.	Teachers have real input into the decision making process in the school.	1	2	3	4
28.	Site Based Management will improve school/parent relations.	1	2	3	4
29.	I play a part in the decision making process regarding				
	a. Selection of instructional materials (textbooks, etc.)	1	2	3	4
	b. Curriculum	1	2	3	4
	c. Instructional techniques	1	2	3	4
	d. Staff development	1	2	3	4
	e. Allocation of resources (Budget)	1	2	3	4
	f. Student discipline	1	2	3	4
	g. Placement of students	1	2	3	4
	h. Assignment of non-teaching duties	1	2	3	4
	i. Extra-curricular activities	1	2	3	4

5

		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4
30.	Answer either A, B, or C				
	a. As a teacher, I have full opportunity to exercise my judgement in my classroom.	1	2	3	4
	b. As a principal, I have full opportunity to exercise my judgement in my school.	1	2	3	4
	c. As another member of, the school community I have full opportunity to exercise my judgement in carrying out my duties.	1	2	3	4

31. Which statement best describes what site based management means to you? (Circle One)

a. Uncertain at this time

b. Decentralization

c. Teacher empowerment

d. Another fad

e. Meaningful involvement of staff in decisions which affect them.

f. Erosion of the contract

g. None of the above.

Appendix C

School Demographic Data as of 1990-1991*

Data Elements

	School A	School B	School C
1. Grade Organization	K-8	K-8	K-4
2. Total Student Enrollment	876	907	337
3. Principal School Appointment Date	1989	1990	1988
4. Student Population by Race			
a. African-American	26%	23%	61%
b. Asian	7%	8%	5%
c. Hispanic	5%	4%	1%
d. White	62%	64%	33%
5. Average Daily Student Attendance	91.6%	91.7%	94.7%
6. Percentage of Students of Low Income Families	47.15%	31.4%	38.5%
7. Total Staff	71	75	29
a. African-American	23	22	19
b. White	48	53	10
a. Male	9	11	5
b. Female	62	64	24

*Source: Superintendent's Management Information Center (M.I.C.), 1990-1991, The School District of Philadelphia, Office of Accountability and Assessment, Report #9215.

APPENDIX D - SCHOOL A

SITE BASED MANAGEMENT BASELINE DATA PILOT RESULTS
N=27

Administrator	0
Teacher	23
Paraprofessional	3
Other	1 Secretary

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	Strongly Agree 4	N/R	Weighted Average
1. Involving parents in decision making in the schcol is a good idea.	1	3	14	9	0	3.15
4. SBM will impact positively on student achievement and attitudes.	1	3	14	9	0	3.15
7. I intend to remain in this school.	0	0	7	19	1	3.73
13. SBM will become a permanent feature in American education.	4	4	9	10	0	2.93
17. There is positive climate in my school.	3	6	12	5	1	2.73
22. SBM is a good idea.	1	4	11	11	0	3.19
24. I look forward to coming to work.	0	2	13	11	1	3.35
26. I like teaching/working in this school.	0	2	8	16	1	3.54

31. Which statement best describes what Site Based Management means to you?

		%
a. Uncertain at this time.	6	22.22
b. Decentralization	3	11.11
c. Teacher empowerment	0	0
d. Another fad.	1	3.70
e. Meaningful involvement of staff in decisions which affect them.	14	51.85
f. Erosion of the contract.	3	11.11
g. None of the above.	0	0
	27	99.99

APPENDIX D - SCHOOL B

SITE BASED MANAGEMENT BASELINE DATA PILOT RESULTS
N=56

Administrator	1		
Teacher	39		
Paraprofessional	4		
Other	1 Parent	1 Bus Monitor	1 Teacher's Aide
	1 Nurse	1 Classroom Assistant	5 Noon Time Aide
			2 Unknown

	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	N/R	Weighted Average
	1	2	3	4		
1. Involving parents in decision making in the school is a good idea.	1	13	27	15	0	3.00
4. SBM will impact positively on student achievement and attitudes.	3	12	29	8	4	2.80
7. I intend to remain in this school.	2	2	10	41	1	3.63
13. SBM will become a permanent feature in American education.	5	11	30	6	4	2.71
17. There is positive climate in my school.	1	2	23	30	0	3.28
22. SBM is a good idea.	4	6	31	13	2	2.98
24. I look forward to coming to work.	0	3	18	34	1	3.56
26. I like teaching/working in this school.	1	1	11	40	3	3.69

31. Which statement best describes what Site Based Management means to you?

			%
a.	Uncertain at this time.	18	32.14
b.	Decentralization	3	5.35
c.	Teacher empowerment	1	1.78
d.	Another fad.	10	17.85
e.	Meaningful involvement of staff in decisions which affect them.	24	42.85
f.	Erosion of the contract.	0	0
g.	None of the above.	0	0
		56	99.97

APPENDIX D - SCHOOL C

SITE BASED MANAGEMENT BASELINE DATA PILOT RESULTS
N=15

Administrator	1		
Teacher	7		
Paraprofessional	2		
Other	1 Unknown	1 Aide	
	2 Parent	1 Secretary	

	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	N/R	Weighted Average
	1	2	3	4		
1. Involving parents in decision making in the school is a good idea.	2	0	5	8	0	3.27
4. SBM will impact positively on student achievement and attitudes.	1	1	5	8	0	3.33
7. I intend to remain in this school.	2	0	0	11	2	3.54
13. SBM will become a permanent feature in American education.	1	4	8	1	1	2.64
17. There is positive climate in my school.	1	1	5	4	4	3.09
22. SBM is a good idea.	1	0	5	6	3	3.33
24. I look forward to coming to work.	1	1	4	5	4	3.18
26. I like teaching/working in this school.	1	1	3	10	0	3.47

31. Which statement best describes what Site Based Management means to you?

			%
a.	Uncertain at this time.	5	33.33
b.	Decentralization	2	13.33
c.	Teacher empowerment	0	0
d.	Another fad.	0	0
e.	Meaningful involvement of staff in decisions which affect them.	5	33.33
f.	Erosion of the contract.	1	6.66
g.	None of the above.	2	13.33
		15	99.98

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, William J., Ed.D., School-Site Management Applied. 1991. Lancaster, Pa.: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc.

David, Jane L., "Synthesis of Research on School Based Management" in "Educational Leadership." Volume 46, Number 8. May, 1989.

Conley, Sharon C. and David B. Lipsky, "Incentive Pay and Collective Bargaining in Public Education." Paper delivered at the American Educational Research Association Convention, San Francisco, California, 1986.

Golarz, Raymond, Address delivered at the School District of Philadelphia Superintendent's Management Convocation. August, 1990.

Short, Paula M., "The Empowerment Project." Paper delivered at the Pennsylvania School Superintendents Conference, Penn State University, October 1990.